

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed September 8, 2003, has been carefully reviewed in light of the Examiner's helpful comments and suggestions.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Qiao in view of Tai and Suzuki. These references have been carefully reviewed but are not believed to show or suggest Applicants' invention as now claimed in any manner. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims is therefore respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claim 7 has been amended and it now requires a diffusion and reflection plate having a coating of diffusion and reflection material formed on the rear side surface thereof and disposed to oppose to the rear side surface of the light guide with a gap therebetween, the material having a diffusion and reflection property. Support for this amendment is found on page 5, second paragraph of the specification. Since the coating of diffusion and reflection material is formed on the rear side surface of the diffusion and reflection plate, the light reflected by the coating is sufficiently diffused in the diffusion and reflection plate. Thus, the brightness of the reflected light becomes uniform. Consequently, the display is uniformly illuminated. As the Examiner has conceded in the Office Action, Qiao does not clearly state that the reflector (28) facing the rear surface of the light guide is a diffusion and reflection element. Moreover, neither Tai nor Suzuki, teaches or suggests a diffusion and reflection plate having a

coating of diffusion and reflection material formed on the rear side surface thereof and disposed to oppose to the rear side surface of the light guide with a gap therebetween. Suzuki teaches a reflector film (7), which does not having any diffusion properties (see col. 4, line 3). In view of these limitations and arguments, it is respectfully submitted that claim 7 is patentable over the prior art combination.

New claim 8 is dependent from claim 7 and it requires the coating of diffusion and reflection material is formed by dots. No new matter has been added. Support for the limitations of claim 8 is also found on page 5, second paragraph of the specification. Therefore, claim 8 is allowable for the same reasons as claim 7.

Each issue raised in the Office Action mailed September 8, 2003, has been addressed and it is believed that claims 7 and 8 is now in condition for allowance. Wherefore, Applicants respectfully request a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,  
DENNISON, SCHULTZ,  
DOUGHERTY & MACDONALD

By: 

Amir H. Behnia  
Reg. No. 50,215  
(703) 837-9600 Ext. 16